

up, but I did just want to let my colleagues know that it is very relevant to our goal of securing our ports. I strongly support the amendment and commend the Senator for his initiative.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment before the Senate that's been offered as a complete substitute to H.R. 4954. This legislation could not be more timely. The anniversary of September 11 is imminent, a stark reminder that our Nation must remain vigilant in the global war on terror.

This amendment, the Port Security Improvement Act of 2006, is critically important legislation. It strengthens port security operations, both in the United States and abroad so we can prevent threats from reaching our shores in the first place.

This legislation improves existing programs for targeting and inspecting cargo containers so that a dangerous shipment doesn't enter or threaten the Nation. It provides direction for further strengthening of these programs as technological advances permit. And, it calls for greater coordination and cooperation among Federal agencies in contingency planning in the event there is a security breach.

This legislation represents a thoughtful reevaluation of how best to meet the Nation's security interests at United States seaports. We have taken a look at what has been done since 9/11. This legislation builds upon that. Terrorists have proven that they will change their ways to exploit perceived weaknesses in our defenses. We need to stay ahead of them. This legislation empowers our personnel in the Department of Homeland Security and United States Border and Customs Protection to do just that.

At the same time, this legislation includes provisions to strengthen the economic security of our Nation. It's important to remember that in addition to killing innocent Americans, the 9/11 attacks were intended to wreak economic havoc and injury upon our Nation. This legislation includes provisions that realign resources to ensure better efficiency in the administration of customs laws within the United States Customs and Border Protection. It authorizes the International Trade Data System, a forward-looking program to better utilize technology in order to increase efficiency and facilitate trade. And, it provides for added resources to better meet all of our economic and trade security interests that are overseen by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

In sum, this legislation is the culmination of months of hard and thoughtful work. I thank my ranking member on the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, my colleagues on the Commerce Committee, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, and my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee, Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, with whom I have

worked so closely to bring this legislation to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in advancing this essential legislation through the Senate in a timely manner.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to comment on the tremendous efforts of the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, Senator LIEBERMAN, and the chairmen and ranking members of the Commerce and Finance Committees, Senators STEVENS, INOUE, GRASSLEY and BAUCUS. They along with their committee staffs have worked together for months to develop the bill that is before us today.

Each of the committees has its own jurisdictional interests in this bill. The Homeland Security Committee has jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security with its primary mission of preventing terrorist attacks against the United States and reducing vulnerabilities to such attacks. Many of the programs in this bill, including the Automated Targeting System, the Container Security Initiative, and the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, serve the purpose of reducing vulnerabilities to terrorist attacks and are operated by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection within the Department of Homeland Security—squarely within the Homeland Security Committee's jurisdiction. Moreover, it was the committee's jurisdictional authority to study the effectiveness of government agency programs that began the evaluation of the DHS' cargo security initiatives that are improved by this bill.

The Commerce and Finance Committees also have significant jurisdictional interests. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over shipping and the Coast Guard. And the Finance Committee has jurisdiction over the assessment of customs duties and compliance with customs laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is no one else who wishes to speak on the bill or the McCain amendment at this time.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a new vision for Amer-

ican independence, a mission that is vital for Americans and for America's homeland and national security.

We Americans have always been freedom seekers. We have been risk takers for liberty, daring to cross oceans and blaze trails across our continent, and at the same time we are reaching skyward to charter our own course into the future. We are always trying to provide a beacon to light the way for others around the world. Now is the time for us to be bold and chart our own course once again.

In this time of expanding promise and unparalleled danger in the world, we are called to come together with a clear vision and a unity of purpose worthy of a great people and a great nation.

We declared our independence from colonial masters more than two centuries ago. We declared our independence from fascism, from imperial communism, and from every other form of totalitarian oppression and brutality in the 20th century. And America belatedly strode forward to become a more perfect union with justice and opportunity for all.

In each of these challenges to our self-determination and our freedom, we not only declared our independence, we also mustered the resolve and the resources to achieve it. It is time for America to declare its independence again.

Nearly 5 years ago, on September 11, 2001, we awoke on a bright, blue-sky morning to the dark realization that a great evil still stalks our world. Out of the shocking smoke and devastation of September 11 came the realization that we are at war—at war with an extraordinarily violent ideology that seeks to pervert a great religion and murder thousands of innocent people to satisfy its thirst for power in a new caliphate from Europe to Indonesia.

Today, we find ourselves engaged in a global war against vile, maniacal terrorists—a war against many foes—including Hezbollah, al-Qaida, the Islamic Jihad, and others, but with its primary theaters being the breeding ground of radicalism and terrorism in the Middle East.

My colleagues, in this war we have our differences over the means and methods, tactics and timetables. We do not have the same conviction about the importance of every theater or every engagement. We do not all see the same causes and effects, nor do we all give credit or cast blame in the same direction.

But there comes a time where we have to set aside such differences and act not as Republicans or Democrats determined to win an election but as Americans determined to win a war, and in so doing preserve our freedom, our values, and our way of life.

Rather than petty political bickering and partisan posturing, let all of us stand together—those of us who understand the reality of the mortal danger that our irreconcilable, fanatical

enemy and its hateful ideology represent. Let's stand apart from those who would still deny or diminish the magnitude of the danger that we face, even as we mourn our thousands dead and foil new plots to kill thousands more.

Let those of us who want to fight this war to win stand together, and let's stand against those who counsel appeasement at the point of a gun, negotiations as missiles rain down, and retreat in the face of adversity.

My colleagues, if that is the new dividing line, I am convinced that the majority in the Senate and in this Congress, and most importantly, all Americans, regardless of political persuasion, are capable of coming together behind a new declaration of independence to secure America's future.

Today, as we combat the powerful forces of terrorism and their state sponsors, we and our allies find ourselves continually dependent on and compromised by Middle Eastern and other hostile sources of foreign oil.

This war is unlike other great wars. In the past, the financial sacrifice of free citizens fueled the engines of industry and military output. But today, many of our gasoline dollars now go to finance the war effort of our enemies, and, if those dollars do not go directly to our enemies now, then they go into bank accounts of some friendly but fragile states—bank accounts that are the envy and object of radical ideologues.

When a nation like Iran has an advanced program to develop nuclear weapons—and when that nation is committed to the destruction of Israel and others—when that nation uses oil as blackmail to keep the international community from confronting its nuclear threat, as the leaders of Iran have done, then we know this: Our peace, freedom, and national security depend on making that oil weapon irrelevant.

Because we rely so heavily on Middle Eastern oil in our economies, our foreign policy options are limited for addressing the terrorism, tyranny, and related geopolitical issues. For America to be free and independent—for Americans to remain the masters of our own destiny—we must declare our independence from Middle Eastern and other hostile sources of oil. We must commit every effort and resource to the achievement of this national purpose.

I strongly believe that a comprehensive, enduring, sustained, and strategic plan for independence from Middle Eastern and other hostile sources of foreign oil must include five essential elements.

They are, first, the strategic use of our global economic power and international relationships to remove oil-based leverage that hostile states currently enjoy; second, the accelerated exploration and development of American energy supplies, including American oil, American natural gas, American clean coal, and American nuclear

power; third, the accelerated research, development, and deployment of every economically viable alternative and renewable source of energy; fourth, a bold new national commitment to innovation and entrepreneurship, investing in the next generation of leading-edge, creative scientists, researchers, and engineers of advanced technology; and, fifth, an unequivocal declaration of our national security commitment to energy independence.

Let me highlight some of these key initiatives that I believe are needed in each of those five areas.

First, we must use our global economic power and international relationships strategically to undercut the oil-based leverage that hostile nations enjoy now and in the future.

We all recognize that America's dependence on Middle Eastern and other hostile sources of foreign oil leaves America and our allies, mainly in Europe and Asia, vulnerable to blackmail from radicals in the Middle East, and even in our own hemisphere, such as the avowed Marxist, Hugo Chavez.

Meanwhile, China is aggressively making oil alliances with Sudan, Cuba, Venezuela, and Indonesia to reduce its dependence on Middle Eastern oil. It is not in the interest of the United States to let Africa and Latin America become dominated by oil trade with China.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I will be introducing a bill for the establishment of America's Energy Security Initiative.

The plan will require the President to establish a permanent energy security working group consisting of representatives of the Department of State, Department of Energy, Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, and intelligence agencies. Our allies will be asked to join us in developing this plan.

We will develop an inventory of all energy reserves worldwide so we can prioritize potential alliances and recognize when strategically important countries come under the influence of others. And we will establish a strategic plan for identifying and forming energy alliances, including bilateral and multilateral arrangements.

The second essential element in our comprehensive plan for achieving independence from the Middle East and other hostile sources of foreign oil is accelerated exploration and development of American energy supplies. We need to adopt a flexible, diverse portfolio of energy options. First and foremost, that must include increased domestic energy production from American oil, more American natural gas, more American clean coal, and more American advanced nuclear energy.

The bottom line is we need more energy explored, produced, grown, and manufactured in America so that hundreds of billions of energy dollars stay here in America and are reinvested in America's economy for American jobs, American competitiveness, and Amer-

ican national security rather than having to worry about the whims of some dictator in a hostile part of the world.

Last month, the Senate passed a Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, a good action by the Senate, and a good first step toward reducing natural gas prices at home and making America less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

This was commonsense, bipartisan legislation that would permit deep-water exploration for oil and natural gas in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. This bill will free up enough natural gas to heat the homes of 6 million American families for 15 years. And there is more oil and natural gas even further into the Gulf of Mexico.

We also need to allow Virginia and other Atlantic coast States to move toward deepwater oil and/or natural gas exploration far off their coasts. According to the Department of Interior, there are roughly 86 billion unexplored barrels of oil and 420 trillion unutilized cubic feet of natural gas under deep water on our Outer Continental Shelf.

The fact is, we have the resources in America and the deep water of our coasts—and also in shale on our land—to reduce the leverage that hostile dictators now enjoy.

We also need to explore for oil and natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska. Critics will say it will hurt the pristine environment. I have been up there. It is a flat, barren, treeless plain. In the summer it is filled with mosquitos, and in the winter it is like the dark side of the Moon.

According to our Department of Energy, the estimated daily oil in ANWR 1.37 million barrels—would be roughly the equivalent of current daily oil imports from Saudi Arabia—1.52 million barrels. That is a lot of oil.

When it comes to natural gas, natural gas is a wonderful, clean-burning fuel. It is needed for heating our homes, and it is also vital for manufacturing, particularly in plastics, chemicals, and fertilizers. We need to make sure that price is reduced at home so those manufacturing jobs stay in America. A lot of the new electric powerplants in this country which have been permitted in recent decades have to use natural gas.

Using natural gas to generate electricity would be like using bottled water to wash your dishes. It will do the job, but why would you want to use a resource as good as that for generating electricity when there are alternatives for generating electricity such as coal?

In fact, the United States is the Saudi Arabia of the world in coal, with 500 billion tons of coal, which is the equivalent of 750,000 billion barrels of oil. We have 27 percent of the world's supply of coal. This is why we should be using clean coal technology for electricity generation.

I recently visited a clean coal facility in King George County, VA, where the smokestacks run so clean you can't even see the emissions from it. If you

didn't hear the whirling, you would think it was closed.

We ought to be using innovative technology to gasify or use coal as a fuel.

Today, I am announcing my strong support for a comprehensive bill directed at advancing domestic coal-to-liquids technologies. Senator BUNNING is the lead sponsor of this Coal-to-Liquids Promotion Act of 2006, authorizing the Department of Energy to administer loan guarantees to the first coal-to-liquids plants and promulgating rules to allow BRAC sites and military bases to be considered as sites for commercial coal-to-liquids plants.

This bill also expands 20 percent tax credits for coal-to-liquids plants and provides a similar provision for expensing these investments, and it also extends the fuel tax credit for coal-to-liquids products from 2009 to the year 2020.

Our comprehensive plan for energy independence must also include using American advanced nuclear power for electricity generation. The Energy Policy Act that we passed last year was a significant step in rekindling the domestic nuclear industry in the United States which has not seen a new nuclear reactor built in the last 20 years. It provides meaningful incentives and protections and it strengthens security for nuclear facilities.

Going forward, as far as nuclear power is concerned, the big impediment for nuclear power is the disposal of spent fuel. This is why we need a comprehensive solution such as the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership that develops a viable long-term solution to the problem of nuclear spent fuel through chemical separation and reprocessing, which is much more efficient and much less dangerous than our current methods of using nuclear power and dealing with spent fuel.

We also need to increase our Nation's refinery capacity. There hasn't been a new oil refinery built in the United States in almost 30 years. In response, I have introduced a bill called The Bolster Our Energy Security for Tomorrow Act, which directs the President to designate three BRAC sites for possible refinery development, with at least one of these refineries producing biofuels, and to appoint a Federal refinery coordinator to negotiate with willing States to streamline the permitting process without changing existing environmental laws.

I have also joined with my colleague and friend from North Carolina, Senator BURR, in introducing the Affordable and Reliable Gas Act. This legislation will help increase refinery capacity and prevent these dramatic spikes in gas prices that we see in this country, usually in the spring, as they shift from a winter blend to a summer blend.

We have 104 "boutique" fuels that strain our refinery capacity, as well as pipeline capacity. Our measure would reduce the number of boutique fuels from 104 to 1 clean-burning diesel fuel

and 4 clean-burning gasoline fuel blends by the end of 2008. That will help reduce gas prices.

We also need, as Americans, to conserve. We need to conserve. We need to look at ways of being less wasteful, more efficient and smart in the use of our energy, particularly in energy used by large computer servers. It is not widely known, but one large computer data center can use as much electricity in 1 day as it takes to power a city the size of Petersburg, VA, with its approximately 34,000 residents. That is so much energy that I want to make sure the Federal Government and companies that use such mega computer servers and data centers are doing so wisely and efficiently.

I have introduced legislation that directs the Environmental Protection Agency, through its Energy Star Program, to study the rapid growth in energy consumption of computer data centers by both the Federal Government and the private sector, analyze how effectively the computer industry is migrating to more energy efficient microchips and servers, reduce the costs associated with building and operating large-scale data centers, and make recommendations for positive incentives to advance adoption of energy-efficient data centers.

The third essential element of our comprehensive plan for achieving independence from Middle Eastern and hostile sources of foreign oil is the accelerated research, development, and deployment of every economically viable alternative source of energy. We need to adopt a flexible, diverse portfolio of energy options. Diversity of supply is security of supply. We ought to be using alternative fuels, such as biofuels, including soy diesel and ethanol, cellulose fuels, and innovative ideas, whether it's hybrids, hydrogen, solar power, or nanotech-enabled lithium ion batteries.

We must take further action to create an economic climate that encourages investment in new energy and alternative fuels. That is why I am reviewing, and I urge my colleagues to consider, legislation that allows 100 percent first-year expensing for all plant and equipment investments to help spur development of domestic and alternative sources of energy.

Expensing is a high-performance tax reform of vital national importance from an energy-specific perspective. According to economists such as Gary Robbins with Fiscal Associates, 100 percent expensing would reduce the capital costs in key segments of the energy industry by up to approximately 10 percent. It would also be important to environmentally friendly "green" technologies, where first-year expensing for the green technologies can often tip the balance between feasible and unfeasible.

In fact, many financial and industry experts believe that expensing is the cheapest, most effective and most growth-oriented tax change that the

Congress can actually make. It has been estimated that replacing the old-fashioned tax depreciation with immediate first-year expensing would add more than \$200 billion to our GDP and upwards of 750,000 new jobs.

The fourth major area in which we must act for energy independence is one that is often overlooked in the usual discussions of national energy policy. We need a bold new national commitment to innovation and entrepreneurship, investing in the next generation of leading-edge scientists, researchers, and engineers.

We should all want America to be the world capital of innovation. To achieve that mission we need scientists, we need engineers, we need technologists. They will be the ones who will be designing and developing the new inventions, the new innovations, and the new intellectual property of the future.

However, America's education system is not graduating sufficient talent in science, technology, and engineering.

Last year, the United States matriculated approximately 70,000 engineers compared to 300,000 engineers in India and 500,000 in China.

In America, we must do a much better job in motivating, inspiring, and incenting our young people to study science, engineering, technology, and medicine at a much earlier age. That is why I have worked, as many have worked, in a bipartisan fashion, with Senators Lieberman, Ensign, Alexander, Domenici, Bingaman, and others on the National Innovation Act, which implements the recommendations of the National Innovation Initiative Report and provides tangible action items, including scholarships, to increase America's science and technology talent.

I am also a strong supporter of the Protecting America's Competitive Edge through Energy Act of 2006, which would boost science and math education programs in the United States by providing early career research grants that support young, promising scientists and engineers at the beginning of their careers.

I have led with a good partner, Senator Ron Wyden, on the other side of the aisle, on our Nanotech Initiative. Nanotechnology is the next transformative economic development for our country and the world. Nanotechnology is a very diverse field. It is going to have a positive impact on life and health sciences. It will have a major impact on microelectronics and materials engineering. Nanotechnology will allow us to build wider and stronger materials that will need less energy for propulsion. There is a company called NanoChemonics, in southwest Virginia, that is teaming up with coal companies to get the impurities out of coal, to make it into a fuel, as is Sasol in South Africa. Nanotechnology will be helpful in environmental cleanups.

All together, the Nanotechnology Initiative, the National Innovation

Act, and the PACE Energy Act will go a long way toward meeting America's rising demand for highly skilled men and women in all fields of innovation, and it will strengthen America's security through energy independence.

Fifth, and finally, I conclude where we must begin, with a clear, unequivocal expression of national commitment, a new Declaration of Independence, if you will, matched with the discipline to keep us on track, according to an agreed-upon timetable. For those who say we cannot come together for such a national purpose, I say you underestimate the character and the resolve of the American people and the power of the American idea.

Look at what we have done in the past when confronted with great challenges to our freedom and our way of life. Half a century ago, the Soviet Union launched the space satellite Sputnik. Our scientific edge in missile technology and the space race was in serious doubt. Our national security was at great risk of falling behind. But America's ingenuity was dramatically and urgently mobilized by President Eisenhower, who passed the National Defense Education Act, providing massive investment in science, technology, and engineering.

We need that same kind of commitment and leadership to keep America the world capital of innovation now and in the future.

September 11 awakened our Nation to a monumental new challenge: fighting and winning this global war against hate-filled terrorists. This war on terror, similar to all wars, will require clarity of vision and unity of purpose. America's long-term national security depends on securing our independence from the Middle East and other hostile sources of oil. We have the resources to do it, the resources underneath our land and water, and the best resource of all, the ingenuity of our free, creative minds. Now we just need the willpower to use it.

Mr. President, 230 years ago our forebears pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor to the cause of independence. We are more fortunate. We need only do what we have already sworn to do—set aside our differences and act in the public interest. This Congress must adopt a clear “Declaration of Independence” from the Middle East and other hostile sources of oil, and it must act urgently, decisively, and with a unity that rises above partisan differences to make that Declaration of Independence a reality.

Let us begin right now.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for about 20 or 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE PHASE II REPORT

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has released to the public two of the five sections of our long-promised report on how intelligence was used by policymakers in the lead-up to the war in Iraq. This phase II report builds on the committee's July 2003 phase I report on the intelligence community's very substantial mistakes regarding weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Fundamentally, these reports are about accountability. They are about identifying the mistakes that led us to war and making sure those mistakes never happen again, so far as we can do so.

Let me share some important excerpts from the report which reflect both my own views and the views of all of my Democratic colleagues on the committee.

The committee's investigation into prewar intelligence on Iraq has revealed that the Bush administration's case for war in Iraq was fundamentally misleading.

Prior to the war, administration officials repeatedly characterized Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs in more conclusive and threatening terms than were substantiated by the underlying intelligence assessments. Analytical assessments of the intelligence community that were not in line with the more strident administration view on alleged Iraqi links to al-Qaida and the 9/11 plot were ignored and were denigrated by senior policymakers. Most disturbingly, the administration, in its zeal to promote public opinion in the United States before toppling Saddam Hussein, pursued a deceptive strategy prior to the war of using intelligence reporting that the intelligence community warned was uncorroborated, unreliable, and, in critical instances, fabricated.

The committee has uncovered information in its investigation which shows that the administration ignored warnings prior to the war about the veracity of the intelligence trumpeted publicly to support its case that Iraq was an imminent threat to the security of the United States.

Some of the false information used to support the invasion of Iraq was provided by the Iraqi National Congress, the INC, an organization which our intelligence agencies had cautioned repeatedly was penetrated by hostile intelligence services and would use its relationship with the United States to promote its own agenda to overthrow Saddam Hussein. The committee's investigation concluded that the INC attempted to influence U.S. policy on

Iraq by providing false information through Iraqi defectors directed at convincing the United States that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and had links to terrorists.

The committee also found the July 2002 decision by the National Security Council directing that the renewed funding of the INC contract—the Iraqi National Congress, the Chalabi operation—be put under Pentagon management was ill advised given the counterintelligence concerns of the CIA and warnings of financial mismanagement from the State Department.

Repeated prewar statements by administration officials sought to connect Iraq and al-Qaida in ways the underlying intelligence simply did not support.

The administration's—this is key—the administration's repeated allegations of the past, present, and future relationship between al-Qaida and Iraq exploited the deep sense of insecurity among Americans in the immediate aftermath of the September 11 attacks, leading a large majority of Americans to believe, contrary to the intelligence assessments at the time, that Iraq had a role in the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

The administration sought and succeeded in creating the impression that al-Qaida and Iraq worked in concert and presented a single unified threat to the United States of America. The committee's investigation revealed something completely different.

The committee found that there was no credible information that Iraq was complicit or had foreknowledge of the September 11 attacks or any other al-Qaida strike anywhere. The committee also found that Iraq did not provide chemical or biological weapons training or any material or operational support to al-Qaida prior to the war.

Furthermore, no evidence was found of any meeting between al-Qaida and the Iraq regime before the war, other than a single meeting that took place years earlier in 1995, in fact, in the Sudan. That meeting was at a fairly low level, and that meeting did not lead to any operational cooperation at all. Osama was there, but the Iraqi representative was at a low level.

Key pieces of evidence used by the administration asserting links between Iraq and al-Qaida were a report of a meeting in Prague between 9/11 hijacker Mohamed Atta and an Iraqi intelligence officer and a claim that Iraq provided chemical and biological weapons training to al-Qaida in the late 1990s. The committee report demonstrates that the prewar statements of the Vice President of the United States that the Prague meeting had been “pretty well confirmed” and that the 9/11 hijacker Mohamed Atta—again the Vice President's words—“in fact” met with Iraqi intelligence services in 2001 were not substantiated by the intelligence assessment at the time the statements were made by the Vice President. Likewise, the statement by National Security Adviser Rice that